

P  
UNIV  
T

BULLETIN

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

NO. 134

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY

GENERAL SERIES, NO. 18

NOVEMBER 1, 1909

*Practice Work in University Departments  
of Education*

BY

FREDERIC ERNEST FARRINGTON,  
Associate Professor of Education, The University of Texas

[Reprinted from the Publications of the National Society of College Teachers of  
Education for 1909.]



PUBLISHED BY  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

*Entered as second-class mail matter at the postoffice at Austin, Texas.*



# PUBLICATIONS

## OF THE

# UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

*Board of Editors*—Killis Campbell, Editor-in-Chief; Eugene C. Barker, Secretary and Manager; Robert A. Law, N. L. Goodrich, F. W. Simonds, A. C. Scott, John E. Rosser, James J. Terrill.

The publications of the University of Texas are issued twice a month. They are arranged in the following series: RECORD, MINERAL SURVEY, GENERAL, HUMANISTIC, MEDICAL, SCIENTIFIC, REPRINT, UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, OFFICIAL. For postal purposes they are numbered consecutively as Bulletins without regard to the arrangement in series. With the exception of the Special Numbers any Bulletin will be sent to citizens of Texas free on request. Communications from other institutions in reference to exchange of publications should be addressed to the University of Texas Library.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS RECORD has been issued from two to four times a year since December, 1898, and is now in its 9th volume. Its purpose is to preserve a record of the life and progress of the University, and for that reason it is of special interest to alumni, ex-students, and friends of the University. Upon request it will be regularly mailed, free, to any citizen of Texas. Address THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS RECORD, Austin, Texas.

The bulletins of the UNIVERSITY EXTENSION and OFFICIAL series, consisting of Announcements of Courses, Catalogues, Regents' Reports, and administrative matter, will be mailed free to any one upon request.

The University still has for distribution copies of the following bulletins:

### GENERAL SERIES

4. *Courses of Study in Law Pursued in the University of Texas*, by J. C. Townes. 16 p. March, 1904.
7. *The Consolidation of Rural Schools*, by Una Bedichek and G. T. Baskett. New edition, enlarged by A. C. Ellis. 85 p., illus. November, 1907. 25 cents.
10. *Views of the University of Texas*. 42 p., illus., n. d. 20 cents.
11. *What Should be Done by Universities to Foster the Professional Education of Teachers?* by W. S. Sutton. 24 p. 1905. 15 cents.
15. *The Teaching of Agriculture in the Public Schools*, by A. C. Ellis. 56 p., illus. December, 1906. 25 cents.
16. *A Study in School Supervision*, by Carl Hartman. 180 p. 1907. 50 cents.
17. *Religious Activities at the University of Texas*. 53 p., illus. August, 1909.
18. *Practice Work in University Departments of Education*, by Frederic E. Farrington. 42 p. November, 1909. 25 cents.

(Continued on inside back cover.)

BULLETIN  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS  
NO. 134

ISSUED SEMI-MONTHLY

GENERAL SERIES, NO. 18

NOVEMBER 1, 1909

*Practice Work in University Departments  
of Education*

BY

FREDERIC ERNEST FARRINGTON,  
Associate Professor of Education, The University of Texas

---

[Reprinted from the Publications of the National Society of College Teachers of  
Education for 1909.]



PUBLISHED BY  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

---

*Entered as second-class mail matter at the postoffice at Austin, Texas.*



Cultivated mind is the guardian genius  
**of democracy.** . . . It is the only dic-  
**tator** that freemen acknowledge and the  
**only** security that freemen desire.


President Mirabeau B. Lamar.

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Several reasons seem to warrant reprinting the following monograph, which was prepared for discussion at the meeting of the National Society of College Teachers of Education in February, 1909, and issuing it as a Bulletin of the University of Texas. In the first place, it will serve purely as a matter of current information. The whole field of education is becoming diversified so rapidly that it is increasingly difficult to keep up with the march of events. The University of Texas owes it to the teachers of the state to keep them informed as to the progress of university education in our sister states, particularly with reference to the evolution in the educational departments, for as De Quincey has suggested, "A man who takes up any pursuit without knowing what advances others have made in it works at a great disadvantage. He does not apply his strength in the right direction." Again, the plan outlined here represents the goal toward which the School of the Art of Teaching at our State University is working. Unfortunately the facilities at our disposal at the present time do not permit of its full realization. This, too, the teachers of the state should know in order that they may help us and that we may reciprocally aid them. The present rapid forward movement of education in this commonwealth presents most encouraging signs that the needed facilities will soon be forthcoming. Finally, it is believed that the study of this paper may suggest to superintendents of school systems ways in which they may increase the standard of efficiency of the teachers under their control, and thus in turn may increase the productive power of the young people who are issuing forth from our schools.

FREDERIC ERNEST FARRINGTON.

Austin, Texas, November 1, 1909.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



# "PRACTICE WORK IN UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION"<sup>1</sup>

## I. THE PROBLEM

Only a little less than sixty years ago the first course in education at an American university was inaugurated at Brown.<sup>2</sup> This short-lived experiment can hardly be considered a success, but, nevertheless, it serves to mark the beginning of a movement that has spread consistently for the last quarter of a century, and that has expanded during the latter half of that period with remarkable celerity. It is significant to note that the prospectus of that first course in education was eminently practical in its aim, at least, in spite of the encyclopædic character of its content, for it touched upon the fields of psychology, school organization, educational theory in its dynamic aspects, and special method in various subjects. The first real chair in education, that at the University of Michigan, was likewise established under the ægis of utilitarianism, although the scope of its work was immediately broadened so that it was concerned primarily with the more cultural and theoretical aspects, in order that its courses might conform the more readily to the standard of true university subjects. The latter tendency, so marked at that time, seems largely to have determined the trend of subsequent efforts within the same field. It is only within recent years that the early utilitarian basis has again become prominent, and we are brought face to face with the problem of practice work. The presence of this problem is doubtless due to two causes: (1) the feeling that the traditional method of work of the normal school in the preparation of elementary teachers would be equally an instrument of good in university work; and (2) the growing conviction that theory without practice implies lack of efficiency.

<sup>1</sup>This monograph was presented at the meeting of the National Society of College Teachers of Education held in Chicago, February 23-24, 1909, and is reprinted from the publications of that Society.

<sup>2</sup>HINSDALE, *Study of Education in American Colleges and Universities*, Educational Review, XIX, p. 112.

Despite the widespread though not unanimous conviction that the normal school and the university each has its own field of work, that the function of the former is the training of elementary teachers, and that of the latter is the training of secondary and higher teachers, and furthermore regardless of the fact that neither one is able to supply the legitimate demand for its own particular product, each one seems to be trenching upon the domain of the other. Thanks to the reprehensible blanket system of certification that prevails in nearly all the states, whereby any certificate carries the right to teach in any grade of school,<sup>1</sup> the normal schools are aspiring to train teachers for secondary schools, and in like fashion, the universities are every year sending their students out into the elementary schools. In fact, more than one normal school is covertly if not openly competing with the universities for this opportunity—a course which must sooner or later give rise to unfortunate hard feeling and invidious recriminations. The root of the whole evil lies in the mistaken notion that the secondary teacher has a higher calling than the elementary teacher. Our American teachers ought so to be imbued with the true spirit of democracy that they would steadfastly reject any attempt to inoculate the great teaching body with the serum of such a professional caste spirit. Surely the builder of the superstructure has no more respectable or responsible task than that of the layer of the foundation. That wise old English schoolmaster, Mulcaster, in contending that the early instruction ought to be done by the best teachers who should likewise be most liberally recompensed for their pains, was merely putting in a little different fashion what Plato had maintained two thousand years earlier, that “in every work the beginning is the most important part, especially in dealing with anything young and tender.”<sup>2</sup> The kindergartner has as noble a calling as the college professor; the grade teacher is as worthy of respect as the classical teacher in the high school. The existence of these different classes of teachers is merely a practical recognition that the economic principle of the division of labor applies with equal force to the teaching profession. There are some people that by

<sup>1</sup>CUBBERLEY, *Certification of Teachers*; Fifth Yearbook, National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, pt. II., 1906, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>*Republic*, II., p. 377.



nature or training are best suited for kindergarten work, others that succeed better with elementary school pupils, still others that find best expression of their capacities in handling adolescents.

The colleges and universities have offended, too, in assuming that they can do the work of the normal schools. True their education departments might be so organized that they could discharge this responsibility, but constituted as they are at present, the emphasis is largely on the side of teaching *subjects* rather than on teaching *children*. The normal school that requires a four-year high school course for entrance and is thus free to devote itself largely to the professional side of the elementary school subject matter has the advantage of the college and university departments of education, as they are constituted at present, in the preparation of teachers for the lower schools. If the elementary schools generally were organized on the departmental plan, some of the disadvantage might be obviated, but at present it is manifestly impossible for the university to give that attention to all the subjects of the elementary school curriculum that is so essential for teachers entering upon that particular field. Our best normal schools spend a relatively small amount of time in taking up new subjects of study *per se*, but they devote themselves primarily to reviewing the elementary branches through the media of those more advanced. It is not so much a more extensive study of the lower subjects that is needed as a more intensive study of those same subjects with a view to teaching them. To the extent that the institutions of higher learning fail to do this—it is by no means to their discredit; they have another function in the intellectual world—to that very extent do they fall behind the normal school in the preparation of elementary teachers. Because all our normal schools are not ideal either in their conditions for entrance or in the character of their work does not justify the universities in attempting to assume part of these burdens. Each institution has abundant work in its own particular field. Let us rather work together to build up the standard of these lower professional schools until they attain the highest type of efficiency of which they are capable.

The contention often urged that the university students take up elementary work merely as a stepping stone to secondary work later does not justify the practice. It is simply emphasizing the

notion that teaching is a kind of jack-of-all-trades accomplishment, that the appellation "teacher" is a passport to any grade of activity from the kindergarten to the university, and this is all tending to delay the recognition of the teaching career as a real profession. The attitude of the teachers themselves is most helpful toward encouraging the all too prevalent feeling that teaching is an avocation rather than a vocation. In many of our states, young men especially take up teaching as a stepping stone to medicine or the bar. Is there any more reason why teaching should be the hand-maid of these other professions rather than that they should perform the same service for it? The argument that if these men were thus excluded the profession would show a still greater preponderance of women teachers would probably hold true, at least for the present, but is the loss of these particular individuals so much to be deplored? The professional institutions cannot now keep up with the demand. Might they not better devote their time and effort to preparing those that at least enter the profession without the avowed intention of quitting it after a year or two? The world may owe these temporary teachers a living, but it gives them no right to take this at the expense of the helpless boys and girls on whom they try their unpracticed hand. There might be some slight justification for thus practicing upon the youth, if the succeeding classes were to derive any benefit from the sacrifice of their older brothers and sisters, but just about the time these temporary teachers are becoming efficient, they leave their avocation, teaching, to take up their vocation, medicine or law. Then the process is begun anew, and another class of pupils form the subjects to be experimented upon in the educational dispensary. Our school trustees and boards of education have no moral right to expose their children to this form of experimentation, and we college and university men who are presumably all educational experts have no right to encourage them in this procedure.

There is one legitimate avenue by which the university is fully justified in sending its men into the elementary field, and that is by providing supervisory and administrative officers. One of the most effective ways of doing this is to take individuals who have already proved their efficiency as teachers; and for such there is no need for the university to provide further practice work. It



ought to be a canon of educational administration that nobody is fitted to supervise or direct an educational system who has not had first-hand acquaintance with the work of the rank and file in such a system. The French military academy at Saint-Cyr (corresponding to our West Point) has recently made a most practical application of this principle. Now, the French boy who succeeds in the gruelling competition for entrance is immediately sent out into the army to serve as a private for one year, at the end of that period returning to the academy for his professional training. Only in this way, it is believed, can the future officer properly understand the position and the point of view of the private soldier. The same principle would appear to be applicable with equal force to the training of the educational officers. On the other hand, not merely efficient teaching can qualify a person for supervisory or administrative positions in the school system, any more than can effective discharge of the private's and petty officer's duties qualify one for a commission in the army. There are certain other qualities and abilities that are not acquired through mere practice. The ordinary teacher elected to an administrative position is no more fit to plan a course of study than is the corporal to command a regiment. The university in its historical and theoretical courses can and does provide the training which together with the previous practical experience renders one capable of performing the particular task indicated as well as those others that fall to the lot of the school administrative officer.

In view of the foregoing, the problem of the university with reference to the training of teachers would seem to resolve itself into this: in the first place the training of competent supervisory and administrative officers for the lower schools and the general school system; and, secondly, the training of the rank and file of the secondary and the higher teachers. As was implied above, it is this second group for whom the university practice work is primarily intended. .

## II. THE FUNCTION OF PRACTICE TEACHING

Dr. Dewey in a paper read before a sister organization a few years ago opened with these words: "I shall assume without further argument that adequate professional instruction of teachers is

not exclusively theoretical, but involves a certain amount of practical work."<sup>1</sup> Whatever may be the theoretical attitude of the institutions represented in our society toward this question, the present practice today does not seem to justify Dr. Dewey's assumption (for in only eleven of the thirty-seven colleges and universities represented here and reporting does practice teaching form a part of the required work, and only twelve others offer such a course), and one of our members goes so far as to say: "We have no practice teaching whatever (i. e., at our university). We do not think it desirable for secondary training in people of college standing."

What is the function of practice teaching in the professional training of secondary teachers? M. Langlois put the whole question in a nutshell when he said: "One has a right to demand three qualifications in prospective secondary teachers: that they should know what they are to teach; that they should know more than they are to teach; and that they should know how to teach." And a little further on he adds: "It is only in England and in the United States, that the respect of personal liberty has been pushed to the point of charlatanism, to the point of tolerating that anybody at all can teach anything at all."<sup>2</sup> Truly a rather severe arraignment of our teaching staff, but, nevertheless, I regret to acknowledge, a just criticism.

Assume for the moment that these first two conditions have been met. What of the third? Does the keen analysis of even an impartial foreign observer justify us in imposing the practice teaching requirement on our prospective secondary teachers? Let us glance into the outside world of affairs for possible analogous situations. What would we think of a master plumber who attempted to turn out competent workmen by discussing theoretically the relative values of iron and lead pipe under given conditions, by explaining carefully even with practical demonstrations the methods of cutting threads and wiping joints without giving the learner the chance to try those processes for himself? Would this master workman think of turning over to such a tyro the responsibility of

<sup>1</sup>DEWEY, *Relation of Theory to Practice*. Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, pt. I., p. 9.

<sup>2</sup>LANGLOIS, *La préparation professionnelle à l'enseignement secondaire*, p. 101.



selecting the material and installing the system of plumbing in a fine modern dwelling? Yet in case of failure the damage could be repaired at a comparatively slight monetary expenditure, and a competent workman could be sent to do the work properly. Most of our secondary teachers begin their work with no more fitness for their tasks than the plumber's helper. Yet the development of social efficiency in our children is a far more responsible undertaking than installing the sanitary system of a human habitation. In the former case there is no possible way of repairing a botched piece of work.

Turning to the walks of professional life, we find a similar state of affairs prevailing there. It is not so very many years ago since the young doctor was sent out into the world with his professional equipment derived solely from lecture courses and laboratory work at the medical school. He knew his medical theory and the effect a certain drug ought to have, but it was entirely problematical as to whether he could find a case that exactly fitted into the conditions of his theory, or whether some unexpected contingency might not entirely nullify the ordinary action of the drug in question. Is it any wonder, then, that the country doctor whose skill had been gathering chiefly through common sense, careful observation, and long experience, would be preferred to the young medical school graduate? Now all this earlier preparation of the prospective physician is supplemented by numerous clinics and an extensive hospital experience before the young man begins the actual practice of his profession. Not that the process of learning by trial and error is any less effective than it was before—for the practitioner—but it is attended with less serious consequences for the patients. Is the responsibility involved in dealing with the human mind any less than that in handling the human body? The physician's skill is immediately measurable; he kills or cures in the individual case, and the incident is closed. The effect of the teacher's treatment is far more subtle; its effects are usually discernible only after the lapse of time, when it is too late to repair the injury. The preparation of the teacher without practice is very much akin to that of the doctor without clinics and hospital experience. The idea underlying the change in the preparation for a medical career is most fundamental and it is psychologically sound: it is considerably

more economical to keep people from making mistakes than it is to correct mistakes after they have been made. The lessons are perhaps more forcibly learned in the latter case, but at what a waste of energy! One has only to recall the recent growth of parental schools and reformatories with the view of diverting the current that is tending prisonward, in order to find another application of this fundamental truth. This same principle has long obtained widespread practical recognition in the educational systems of France and Germany, but it is only beginning to be appreciated in our American schools.

In the other professions like law, ministry, architecture, and engineering, there is not the same public interest in specific practical preparation for the vocation, for failure or "practising upon the public" entails few or no deleterious effects on society, but merely reacts upon the individual. In law the neophyte gains this practical training in association with older and more experienced members of his profession, or ekes out a precarious existence through the unimportant cases and the court assignments that may fall to his lot. But in neither condition is the public socially interested in his success. It demands good lawyers and it is going to find them, but it is of no particular moment how many poor ones there are. The conditions are quite different in teaching. Not only does the public welfare demand competent teachers, but it is of vital importance to reduce to a minimum the possibility of having poor ones.

In a profession, then, like medicine, where the interest of society in individual excellence is large, and in even other professions, like law, architecture, and engineering, where the social good is less intimately bound up with individual success, practical work as a requisite for obtaining university sanction is coming to play a larger and larger part.

In the professional preparation of the teacher, practice is not in the least intended to supplant theory, but merely to supplement it, to vitalize it, to render it useful, and to give the student some training in applying it. What shall it avail a teacher if he has learned from the history of education that Comenius stood for things, in his sense of the term, as opposed to mere words, and yet find him trying to teach geography, for example, without any refer-



ence to the wealth of natural phenomena at his very door? Even Dotheboys Hall did better than that. As Dickens pointedly observes, not only did the poor wretches there learn to spell "window," but they gained intimate knowledge of what a window was by being sent forthwith to wash one! Wherein is there any practical value in a teacher's being able to discuss intelligently the principle of apperception with the various implications contained therein if she conducts a Latin class with little or no regard for the English roots that are present on every page of Latin text? An understanding of the basic principles of school hygiene and class control is essential for every teacher, but when one finds a class room where the pupils are listless and inattentive largely because the teacher has neglected to employ the means at her command for obtaining a supply of fresh air, is it any wonder that school authorities often look askance at the university-trained teacher? The number of like instances might be increased almost indefinitely if the members of our departments of education would only follow the products of their own theoretical courses out into the schools. We have tried to teach our students to swim by a thorough drill in the principles of buoyancy and aquatics, but we have refused to give them even a swimming pool where they might try to see if they could prove the worth of these principles, or even where they could see other swimmers at work. The crying need today in our university departments of education is for these "swimming pools."

However desirable it might be theoretically if we could retain these education students until they had thoroughly mastered the technique of the teaching process, in other words, until they had completed their apprenticeship and were ready to go forth as real master workmen in their profession, in actual practice such a procedure is manifestly unfeasible and impossible. We have neither time, nor accommodations, nor instructing staff for any such task. All we can hope to do is (1) to give them opportunity to see good teaching, and to know it, and furthermore to know why it is good—in other words, to develop in them the ability to project mere processes upon a background of principle in order to estimate their real worth as educational instruments; (2) to enable the students to verify by their own tests the identical principles that they ac-

cept theoretically; and (3) to give some facility in handling the processes employed in class room instruction.

The first of these needs little elaboration at this point. If you want people to write well, your first task is to give them the most reputable authors and stylists to study. If you expect to develop artists, you put them in touch with the works of the great masters. If the government desires to train its young officers most effectively, it sets them to studying the fortifications of Vauban, the campaigns of Gustavus Adolphus, of Napoleon, of Wellington, and furthermore it sends its representative to follow the army in the field whenever there is a struggle between nations. We may even admit that superintendents send their teachers to watch other teachers at work, and in more than one community there are regularly appointed "visiting days" when all the teachers are sent to adjacent towns to see other teachers handling the actual conditions of school work, to profit by their errors, to learn and to derive inspiration from their successes. Should we think of doing less by the young people whom we are about to send forth to take up the active work of teaching? We owe this to the students; we owe it to the university; we owe it to the children in the schools.

The so-called laboratory aspect of practice teaching fulfils the same function here that it does in any ordinary laboratory science. Not that students are expected to discover new principles of the learning process or school control, but the reworking of the old principles serves to impress them upon the student mind as no amount of theoretical study can possibly do. This second stage which serves to introduce the student gradually to the mechanics of class teaching is divided into several distinct operations:

(1) Observation in a given class room with a view to taking charge of that particular class. This is quite different from general observation, for it includes learning the names of the various pupils, studying the individual differences and the way of approach to each particular child, not so much disclosing the phenomena of the mental process in general, as providing a source of information to be drawn upon when the student has to handle these pupils himself.

(2) Presence in the class room in the capacity of student assistant, with the idea of making himself useful to the class teacher



in any way that offers. Under this head would come: the reading of examination papers, and the correction of compositions and other written work; in laboratory subjects, the preparation and assembling of materials and actual assistance given to pupils in the laboratory; all of which tasks require an ability to weigh, appreciate, and select that is entirely novel to the student who has always approached a subject from the purely academic point of view. Here, too, properly belongs the coaching of individual pupils that have fallen behind through illness or absence, or that need private work.

(3) The preparation of lesson plans. Here one element of the teaching process is isolated from an entangling complex. The student is free from the responsibility of class control; he has abundant time for reflection; and he can give his undivided attention to arranging his material in a psychological order for presentation to the pupils. Then for the first time the student begins to appreciate that the teaching order is not necessarily the logical order, that whereas he has heretofore looked at subject matter objectively, he must now change his point of view and regard it subjectively. It is one thing to master a subject in order to pass an examination upon that subject; it is quite a different problem to master it so as to call out the proper responses in the learners.

(4) The teaching of a single lesson, one that has been previously worked over as just indicated. At best this must be an unreal sort of procedure. The presence of the critic teacher relieves the student largely if not entirely of the discipline problem, that stumbling block of most young teachers, but by that very fact it allows the student to concentrate his attention upon the presentation of his subject matter.

This gradual approach enables the student to isolate the more important elements of the teaching process, to center his attention upon them singly, and to acquire an adequate comprehension of the problem involved, if not actually to master each individual step, before attempting to combine all into a synthetic whole. It requires only slight reflection to see the advantage from a scientific point of view that such a method enjoys over that which prevails in many of our colleges and universities today of giving, if you please, even a thorough theoretical equipment, and then casting the stu-

dent bodily into the school room with the implied counsel: "We have done all we can for you. You have your basis of knowledge; there is the school; go ahead and make your own adjustments."

This analysis that we have just outlined possesses the two-fold advantage of guiding the student when he has most need of such assistance, and of protecting the children from the flounderings of the tyro. The first implies no coddling process, for under intelligent administration, the student must take each of these steps for himself, but it enables him to do this under an economical, ideational process rather than by the longer and more wasteful empirical procedure. It necessitates real teaching, and makes practical application of a principle that has already been suggested: "It is distinctly more pedagogical to prevent the student from making mistakes than to correct them after they are made." The second consideration has not yet been sufficiently appreciated in our educational procedure. This idea of shielding the pupils from the practice teacher may be justified as a measure of self-protection in a big private school like the Horace Mann School at Teachers College, New York (where many of the tuition fees are considerably greater than those at any of the colleges or universities in the country, and where the parents are paying these large fees in consideration of having none but the very best teaching available), but the same conditions do not prevail in our state universities. It is an undebatable fact that the first teaching of every teacher is practice teaching, whether so denominated or not, whether done in a particular school under the control and supervision of educational experts, or in a remote district school where any close supervision is conspicuous by its absence. If the university educational departments do not assume the responsibility for this first teaching, and it is thereby forced out into the far corners of the state, is there not unjust discrimination against the modest country school, which if anything is less able to recover from the poorly qualified individual teacher? The State High School, University High School, or whatever may be its appellation, with its superior equipment, its skilled critic teachers, all under the personal supervision of an educational specialist, even when a part of the teaching is in the hands of young and inexperienced teachers, will provide a training for the youth that will compare more than favorably with the best ordi-

nary high schools in the state, and it will enjoy the public confidence. Furthermore, such preliminary work *before* the certificate is granted will serve as a sieve through which to sift out the undesirables and the incompetents who ought never to be allowed to enter the profession. Such should be firmly told that they would better seek some other field of activity than teaching.

Finally comes the synthesizing process of all the professional preparation, the actual teaching under as nearly normal conditions as possible. Then the student who has passed successfully through all the various preliminary processes, which, by the way, should be eliminatory at each stage, is put in charge of the class for a period of time, thus reproducing in miniature as nearly as possible the actual conditions of one's teaching experience. The critic still remains near enough to be called upon in case of need, but the supervision is much less close. Then for the first time the student teacher assumes the full burden of class room conduct—teaching, discipline, and all—and he begins to play a part in the educative process in the complete sense of the term, to teach with the consciousness that he is responsible for the intellectual, moral, and dynamic growth of the pupils entrusted to his care. Practically the only real condition of actual teaching experience that is not present here is the feeling that the teacher must somehow “make a go” of it. It is indeed questionable how really valuable this condition may be. True, it does spur on some teachers to success, but the large amount of vital energy used up through the wear and tear on the nervous system might better have been expended in some other way. It is not to be expected even at the end of this last stage of the student teacher's professional preparation that he will have reduced all his class room activities to automatic reactions, so to speak, that he will have become a past master in the art of school management, but it is to be expected that he shall have acquired some real appreciation of the teacher's problem, that he shall have had some practice in projecting processes upon the background of principles, and that he shall have gained some skill in class room conduct, in other words, that he shall have made a fair beginning. The perfection of these processes can only be attained by experience and use, and if we teachers of teachers have done our



work faithfully, this growth will continue as long as our students continue to practice the profession.

### III. WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

This problem of secondary practice teaching is by no means new, however novel its discussion in the United States. When we look at the conditions abroad, we begin to appreciate how far behind we really are. It seems hard to realize that as far back as 1826,<sup>1</sup> even before there were any definite plans for the establishment of an elementary normal school in this country, Prussia began to require the *Probejahr* or year of trial teaching of all candidates for appointment in the secondary schools. In 1890, partly from the fact that the number of men preparing for teaching in these schools had grown so embarrassingly large, and partly from a desire to increase the professional requirements, still another year, called the seminar year, was inserted before the *Probejahr*. This succeeded in reducing the number of candidates for teaching honors, and henceforth it formed a part of the professional preparation for the secondary service. Here, then, are two years of practical work (following the three years of academic study in the university, and one year of private preparation for the state examination), the former devoted largely to what has previously been denominated the laboratory aspect of the practice work, and the latter to a year of real practice teaching, six or eight hours per week.

The significant points for us to notice here are: first, the amount of preparation for the teaching profession after the work of the *Gymnasium* is completed (this carries the pupil considerably farther than even our best high schools)—three or four years in the university, one preparing for the state examination, one in the seminar, and one in the trial teaching, all of this going a long way toward building up a good wholesome conviction that teaching is as real and as worthy a profession as law, medicine, or theology; and second, the fact that the practical side of this professional training is given outside the universities and in institutions beyond their control, partly in regular seminaries established for that purpose, and partly in certain selected secondary

<sup>1</sup>RUSSELL, *German Higher Schools*, p. 363.

schools. The extremely centralized character of the German educational system and the very high professional attainments of the secondary principals and teachers are contributory factors in the success of this latter kind of training. The degree of centralization that prevails in Germany would be quite out of the question with us, nor would it be desirable, but satisfactory substitutes are perhaps within the bounds of possibility. Although the perfection of the German system is beyond our reach at the present, yet I believe one or more teachers capable of doing a part of this work could be found within reasonable distance of practically every one of the institutions represented in this society.

In Germany, the number assigned in any year to any one of these "preferred" schools is small, from three to seven at the most. Notwithstanding that there is regular theoretical work once a week under the leadership of the director, the chief purpose of the year is to acquaint the students with the practical working of a secondary school. Throughout this period they are required to attend all faculty meetings, they are given practical training in school control, the conduct of examinations, and in the use of apparatus, material, and other accessories. The first quarter is spent almost entirely in observation, while the subsequent class room practice includes two or three lessons per week taught under the eye of the director or some other of the regular teachers, together with certain set lessons which are conducted in the presence of all the students assigned to the school and which form the basis of extended criticism from the director. It should be observed here that by this time every student knows what subjects he intends to teach; in fact these have all been determined by the result of his state examination. He teaches these *and no others*.

The *Probeyahr* is passed in much the same fashion, save that it is even more practical in its experience. The students are sent by twos to certain designated schools, and there they teach six or eight hours per week under the oversight of skilled teachers.

In comparison with these two years of practical work, the amount that we devote to a like purpose seems paltry indeed. The German principle, "Make haste slowly," finds no counterpart in the feverish anxiety to rush our students through the mill at top speed. Germany is still quite content with the hand work,

while America seems to prefer the factory, machine-made product, even in the educational field.

In France, despite the growing part taken by the provincial universities in the preparation of secondary teachers, the Higher Normal School at Paris still retains much of its former prestige. This school, which in its permanent form antedated the first of the above-mentioned German seminaries by nearly a score of years, was for a considerable period nothing more than a university of a specialized type, fortunate enough to have a selected group of students with whom to work. Since the reform in secondary education in 1902, the instruction has been taking on a more and more pronounced professional character. For years the scholarship side had been developed so intensively that its graduates were quite as competent to undertake real university teaching as to enter the secondary service. A strong reaction is going on there at this very moment, all tending to provide a professional preparation, commensurate with the academic, which latter has at no time been questioned.

The "practice" of the normal student, which is confined to the third and last year of the course, is of two sorts: in the first place, lessons presented to the student's classmates of the normal school; and in the second place, actual teaching in the city lycées. The drawbacks of the former will be at once apparent, but this disadvantage is not so great as might be expected, for after all these lessons do not differ materially from the lecture and quiz method generally employed in the secondary schools. The work is so arranged that during the year each student will have to conduct from three to twelve lessons in each subject he is preparing to teach. The presentation is subsequently criticized by his fellows and finally by the professor in charge. Inasmuch as each professor is absolutely free to carry on his course as he sees fit, and as he has been chosen for his work without any regard to his ability to train up others, it is evident that the practical value of the criticisms from the teaching point of view will depend entirely upon the individual. Some of these criticisms are based upon a fine appreciation of the needs and capacities of the secondary school boy, while on the other hand some, however searching and keen they may be, are exactly the sort one might expect to



hear passed on a public lecture delivered before a mature audience.

The second sort of practice, the actual teaching in the city lycées, has lately taken on new life. Formerly a two weeks' task, disagreeable to the normal student, looked upon as an imposition by the lycée teacher, and often treated as a lark by the pupils, this practice period is now reduced to serious work. The best that can be said, however, is that it is done under competent teachers. In the modern languages the practice teaching is considerably more extensive, for the three weeks for the ordinary subjects are expanded so that the period covers nearly two thirds of the academic year, the best of the lycée teachers are selected for this purpose, and they are paid four hundred francs per year extra for their services. This plan for the modern language teachers is yet in the experimental stage. If it succeeds it will probably be extended, at least in some measure, to the other subjects. The great weaknesses here, however, are in the first place, the unreality of the practice, and in both cases, the chasm existing between theory and practice, for there is no one person in whom the responsibility for this work can be centered.

The problem in our own training institutions is widely different from that which one meets abroad, the mere numbers involved being of immense significance. The enrollment in the three classes at the Higher Normal School in Paris, for instance, is only slightly in excess of one hundred and fifty, whereas in the University of Texas alone, the number of students in the educational department is upwards of two hundred and fifty. Yet the former is nominally the training school for all the lycées in France with its thirty-eight millions of population, while the latter serves in its own way but a single state. The traditional social conditions which apply with equal force to Germany and France account largely for this striking difference in the mere numerical nature of the problem in the new and the old world. The fact, too, that abroad, education is a national responsibility rather than a state or local question as here, makes possible the high degree of centralization that prevails on the continent with its consequent ease of control. With each of the American states the sole arbiter of its educational affairs, there is naturally no uniformity of procedure.

In order to find out what is being done at the present time in the United States, a series of questions was sent out to all the institutions represented in the membership of this society, all the state universities, and some six other colleges and universities added for various reasons, in all amounting to sixty-nine institutions.

The table on the opposite page, which includes only those institutions replying to the questionnaire, will show some of the more important details of the facilities and conditions of the practice course. With few exceptions, one may fairly assume that in the other institutions no such opportunities are available.

The following comments will throw additional light on the categorical answers given above:

Adelphi College. The practice teaching, evidently of a sporadic nature, is done in the preparatory department, but this school is used more for demonstration than for practice purposes. The tuition fees, \$60 to \$180 per year, partially account for this. "At present there are so many who wish license number 1 that we cannot give practice in elementary teaching. We still give occasional practice work in high school subjects." It may not be taken until the senior year.

University of Arkansas. The University Normal School requires daily teaching during the fourth year of the course, that is, corresponding to the university sophomore class.

Brown University has a remarkably effective arrangement for practice teaching. The working agreement that has been in force for several years has now received formal official sanction in a contract entered into, June, 1908, between the School Committee of Providence and the university authorities. By the terms of this contract the university is enabled to use the city high schools for practice work in consideration of an honorarium paid the teacher to whom the student is assigned. In return the city has an assured source of supply for high school teachers and is able to apply a probation test that is fair to the candidate and an effective safeguard for the city. The double authority is unified in the person of the professor of theory and practice at the university, who is likewise director of the training department in the Providence High Schools. The teaching is carried on simultaneously with the university work, the director meeting the students for



# STATUS OF PRACTICE TEACHING IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

INSTITUTION	Training for elementary (E); secondary (S); secondary and elementary (B) schools.	Practice teaching required (req.); optional (opt.); not given (no).	Amount of practice in weeks and periods per week.	Practice school under control of the department.	Definite plans for establishing such a school.	Use local schools for practice teaching.	Recommendation of other departments required for admission to course.	Subjects required for admission to practice course.*	Minimum standing in University required for admission to course; freshmen (fr.); soph.; jr.; sen.; gr.
Adelphi College.....	B.....	opt.....		yes.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	ab.....	sen.
University of Arkansas.....	B.....	req.....	40; 5.....	yes.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	abf.....	.....
Brown University.....	B.....	opt.....	40; 5-15.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	bigls.....	gr.
University of California.....	B.....	req.....	20; 5.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	af.....	gr.
University of Cincinnati.....	B.....	req.....	30; 1.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	abig (n or o)	sen.
Clark University.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	a.....	jr.
Colorado College.....	B.....	req.....	16; 1.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	yes.....	ag.....	sen.
University of Colorado.....	B.....	opt. <sup>7</sup> .....		yes.....	no.....	no.....	no.....	abc.....	jr.
Columbia, Teachers College.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
Cornell University.....	B.....	req. <sup>1</sup> .....		no.....	no.....	yes <sup>1</sup> .....			
Drake University.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....				
University of Florida.....	B.....	req.....	7; 5.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	abfgp.....	sen.
George Washington University.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....		
University of Georgia.....	B.....	opt.....	15; 3-5.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	klop.....	sen.
Harvard University.....	S.....	opt.....		yes.....	no.....	no.....	no.....	agpr.....	sen.
University of Illinois.....	B.....	opt.....	12; 3.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	yes.....	bignp.....	sen.
University of Indiana.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
University of Iowa.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
Johns Hopkins University.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
University of Kansas.....	S.....	opt. <sup>2</sup> .....	9-18; 5.....	yes.....	yes.....	yes.....	yes.....	a (f or g)	sen.
Lehigh University.....	S.....	opt.....	20; 1.....	yes.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	nothing.....	gr.
Leland Stanford Jr. University.....	S.....	req.....	12; 5.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	fgp.....	jr.
McGill University.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
Massachusetts Agricultural College.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
Miami University.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	yes.....	no.....	no.....		
University of Michigan.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
University of Minnesota.....	S.....	opt.....	8-16; 3-5.....	yes.....	no.....	no.....	no.....	af b or i (k or o)	sen.
University of Mississippi.....	B.....	req.....	35; 3.....	yes.....	yes.....	yes.....	no.....	bfgklop.....	sen.
University of Missouri.....	B.....	req.....	18; 2.....	yes.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	atfi.....	sen.
University of Nebraska.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....	nothing.....	fr.
University of New Mexico.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
New York University.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
University of North Dakota.....	B.....	no <sup>2</sup> .....		yes.....	no.....	no.....	no.....	bfgk <sup>3</sup> .....	sen.
Northwestern University.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
Ohio State University.....	S.....	req.....		no.....	yes.....	yes.....	no.....	abfgkopt.....	sen.
University of Oregon.....	S.....	req.....	18; 5.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	befh.....	sen.
University of Pennsylvania.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	yes.....	yes.....	abcd <sup>4</sup> ghip.....	sen.
University of Rochester.....	B.....	opt.....		yes.....	yes.....	yes.....	no.....	lgo <sup>5</sup> .....	jr (fr <sup>1</sup> )
University of South Dakota.....	B.....	req.....		no.....	yes.....	yes.....	no.....	bfil.....	sen.
Syracuse University.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	yes.....	yes.....	no.....		
University of Texas.....	B.....	opt.....		no.....	yes.....	yes.....	no.....		
Ursinus College.....	S.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
University of Virginia.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....	abp.....	jr.
Washington University.....	S.....	opt.....	19; 2.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	no.....		
University of Washington.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
Wellesley College.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
Western Reserve University.....	B.....	no.....		no.....	no.....	no.....	no.....		
University of West Virginia.....	S <sup>6</sup> .....	opt.....	24; 1.....	no.....	no.....	yes.....	yes.....	(a or b) ghi	sen.
William and Mary College.....	S <sup>5</sup> .....	req.....	10; 5.....	yes.....	yes.....	yes.....	yes.....	abgp.....	soph.
University of Wisconsin.....	S.....	opt. <sup>6</sup> .....		yes.....	yes.....	yes.....	yes.....	abglp.....	soph.
University of Wyoming.....	E.....	req.....	36; 5.....	yes.....	yes.....	no.....	yes.....		

\* (a) psychology; (b) educational psychology; (c) genetic psychology; (d) ethics; (f) history of education; (g) principles of education; (h) philosophy of education; (i) educational theory; (j) school hygiene; (k) school administration; (l) school management; (n) elementary education; (o) secondary education; (p) observation; (r) special method course; (s) general method; (t) sociology.

(1) For elementary teachers only.

(2) This is chiefly in connection with methods courses in Latin, mathematics, and modern languages.

(3) Some opportunity is offered for practice work within the courses in the department.

(4) For elementary teachers, bjnp.

(5) Also trains for administrative work.

(6) In the German department.

(7) Required of those who have not previously taught.

regular instruction and visiting them frequently during their class work. The director arranges their assignments in conference with the high school principals, and in case of marked inefficiency in either scholarship or discipline, he initiates the movement for their dismissal.

The director, too, nominates the supervising teachers from among the regular staff, the actual appointment being made by the Committee on High Schools. In return for the supervision of the student teachers assigned to their charge, these supervisors receive fifty dollars per year if the student is of the first type, and in any case they are entitled to attend courses in the education department without fee, but such free course in accordance with this provision may not count toward a degree.

These student teachers of whatever grade must hold the degree of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Pedagogy from some reputable college. They must be acceptable alike to the superintendent and to the professor of education. They must pursue at the same time a certain schedule of courses at the university, which may be counted toward the Master's degree, if they so elect. Successful completion of the teaching and the university work carries with it the teacher's diploma from the university and likewise entitles the student to preferential consideration from the school board when regular appointments are made to the teaching staff.

The student teachers of the first type already referred to (not less than four in number, and ordinarily divided equally between the sexes), are appointed by the Committee on High Schools from a list of candidates who fulfil the required conditions. They receive a uniform salary of four hundred dollars per year, and in everything except the amount of work they are required to perform (ordinarily limited to fifteen hours per week), they are subject to the same rules as other teachers.

Student teachers of the second type are held to the same qualifications, duties, and responsibilities as those of the first type, save that they receive no compensation for their services, they are appointed by the professor of education, subject to confirmation by the High School Committee, and the minimum amount of work required of them is one hundred and twenty-five hours of observation, individual instruction, and class teaching. These

students are expected to "render proper assistance" to the class teachers in return for the supervision they receive.

Although this contract applies only to the high schools, the same practical privileges for observation and teaching in the grammar schools are available for a limited number of seniors that are taking the course in education.

California still holds the very front rank in state requirements for high school teachers. Practice teaching is prescribed, at least four semester hours, with graduate status a prerequisite for admission. The regulation of the State Board of Education which required that after July, 1906, this be done in a "well equipped training school of secondary grade directed by the department of education" was considerably emasculated two years later by a provision that accepted as an equivalent practice teaching done in a grammar school in connection with one of the state normal schools. This retrograde step was taken only after the state university had practically made the regulation a dead letter by failing to make any provision for such a secondary school. The University of California still continues its practice teaching in the local elementary and high schools, while Stanford makes use of the adjacent schools of Palo Alto, and the not distant state normal school at San José.

The College for Teachers of the University of Cincinnati presents a rather unique situation in that although nominally training for both elementary and secondary school positions, and with a differentiated program of work, as a matter of fact its graduates enter the elementary field exclusively. "Our entire problem in Cincinnati is, primarily, the preparation of the elementary school teacher. We have so many college graduates in the grades who have specialized in the various high school subjects, that practically all appointments to high school positions are made from the grades."

In addition to the regular practice teaching in course, immediately after graduation, the students enter upon a two months' period of so-called "cadetting" in order to secure positions upon the city's preferred eligible list. They are still under the direction of the department of education and in the course of this period they acquire a most practical knowledge of the teacher's problems, for during one day in each week they are left alone in charge of



the class. Furthermore, for the first year after appointment in the city schools, the department of elementary education keeps close watch over them, aiding with suggestion, and even sending a cadet for a day or two to relieve the teacher for the purpose of observation.

Though with no real authority over the schools, the department is rendering invaluable service to the city schools, and in return has the necessary field of work for observation and practice put at its disposal. The whole arrangement must result in an unusually high academic standard for the elementary teacher in Cincinnati.

Colorado College, although neither requiring practice teaching for its recommendation, nor even offering a course in the subject, has affiliations with the Colorado Springs High School for substitute work and with a local private school for extra classes. It also enjoys privileges for "cadet and substitute teaching in the grades of the city schools." Furthermore, some little practice teaching is done in connection with the courses in genetic psychology, the history of education, and the principles of education. The courses are open to either juniors or seniors.

The University of Colorado has adopted into its faculty, so to speak, the principal of the Boulder High School, and the principal of one of the elementary schools, the former as instructor in secondary and the latter as instructor in elementary education. Practice teaching is given in both schools. "This vexed problem of all training institutions has been quite satisfactorily solved here by a very simple device. This device consists in breaking up the larger classes in the public schools in Boulder into sections and putting one of these sections in charge of the student teacher, he being under the immediate supervision of the regular class teacher, the school principal, and some one from the College of Education, and under the general supervision of the head of that institution. The section of the class taken by the student teacher is as a rule the smaller section and is composed of those who have had difficulty in getting on—of those who, except for this arrangement, would be likely to fail of passing. Each student in such a section is to some extent a subject for special study and treatment, hence the novice teacher's attention is at once forced where it properly should be: upon *the problem of how children learn rather than upon how teachers should teach.*

"Each such section is a problem, and a set of problems, to be solved by the persons mentioned working together. The student teacher observes the work of the regular class (in which his section frequently recites), sees what the ideal for the day's lesson is and then, when he meets his section, does what he can to attain that ideal. In this attempt he is helped by the supervisor. This sort of thing repeated each day rapidly brings the novice teacher to efficiency. \* \* \* We manage to save to the Boulder schools many who would otherwise drop out."

This scheme has been in operation only since January, 1908. The final sentence above seems to be its justification in the eyes of the school board. It pays its own way, as it were.

Teachers College, Columbia, has a requirement for practice teaching only in the case of those who have not previously taught. This varies between two and forty periods, but for reasons already indicated it is practically restricted to the elementary school, even for those looking forward to secondary work. Junior, senior, or graduate standing is demanded for admission to the course.

George Washington University requires practice teaching for its teacher's diploma, using the seventh and eighth grades of the Washington public schools for that purpose. One student was enrolled in 1907-1908.

The education department of Harvard University demands no practice teaching from the students, but from the fact that it recommends men who have not done practice teaching at that university only when they are known to have had equivalent experience elsewhere, there is some pressure being brought to bear even there. Furthermore, up to the beginning of the present academic year, the work was entirely voluntary, whereas now it counts toward a degree. The first half year the course deals with school administration and management, secondary education, and observation, while during the second half, the course "is conducted in neighboring institutions." The adjacent communities of Cambridge, Newton, Medford, and Brookline, offer facilities for practice teaching in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grammar grades, and throughout the high school. The conditions are as real as possible, for the student is given complete charge of the class for a half year and is held responsible for its success. The work is supervised largely by

the department, although the regular class teachers render effective co-operation. In return for these opportunities, Harvard offers a free course in any department of the university to one teacher for each student thus favored by the schools. The course is open to seniors and graduates.

At the University of Illinois, the Academy is used as a field for observation and practice teaching, the work being under the control of the department of education, while the school itself is a separate organization. The department is furthermore responsible for the work of its student teachers, although members of other departments, the class teachers, and the supervisory officers assist in an advisory capacity. The practice work formerly done in the schools of Champaign and Urbana has evidently been discontinued. Senior standing is required for admission.

Indiana University offers an elective course for practice teaching in the secondary school only, the high school of Bloomington providing the field of work. The high school teachers are the regularly appointed critic teachers, the university supplementing the ordinary salary of each by two hundred and fifty or three hundred dollars per year, in return for the consulting power it exercises in the appointment of those teachers, and for their services with the university students. They give special methods courses in the high school subjects, are consequently members of the school of education, and have direct charge of all the practice teaching. They require lesson plans, conduct special conferences, and do most of the critic work, although the general direction is centered in the person of one of the professors of the department. The practice teaching extends over a trimester, and requires senior standing for admission.

"At the University of Kansas, the departments of mathematics, modern languages, and Latin, in co-operation with the department of education, offer courses in method which involve some practice teaching. Furthermore, the university students are sometimes assigned a class in the Lawrence High School for a semester, receiving some credit in appropriate college courses." No one below senior standing is entrusted with this work, and the supervision is mainly performed by the department.

Lehigh University is carrying on an interesting experiment in



practice teaching. There is a practice school under the control of the department, started in October, 1907, with the professor of education at the head, and five "regularly employed" teachers. Junior standing is requisite for admission to the course, and each student teaches one period per week for twenty weeks. Best of all, the school is self-supporting, with thirty pupils, and fees of twenty-five cents per month per pupil. "The practice school is a night school attended by men and boys who work during the day, some of whom are preparing to enter college, and some simply desire to follow elementary studies. It meets in the university buildings, and there are practically no expenses."

McGill University is starting a course in practice teaching in January, 1909. The department is to have the use of "a model school under the control of the Protestant Commissioners," provision being made for fifty half days of work for each student. The course is open to students of third year standing.

The Massachusetts Agricultural College at Amherst, which is engaging in the training of teachers of agriculture for the secondary schools, has a scheme that is a little out of the ordinary, although it does not differ in principle from the affiliation that has existed for several years between Stanford and the San Jose Normal School. As yet no practice course is offered at the college, but there is "an arrangement with one of the state normal schools, whereby one of the faculty spends a part of the year at that school giving instruction in agriculture, school gardens, etc., as well as directing the work of the model school teachers in some phases of nature work. . . . As yet there has been no interchange of pupils from one school to the other," but it is hoped to bring this to pass.

The University of Minnesota has had a regularly organized practice school since December, 1907. Only the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades are now in operation, but the college is looking forward toward a complete high school organization, with some upper grade work for observation by prospective principals. Senior standing is required for admission to the practice course, and the teaching covers a period of eight or sixteen weeks. There are no relations with the public schools, the observation work that was formerly done in the schools of Minneapolis and St. Paul having been

given up just previous to the opening of the university practice school.

The University of Mississippi imposes practice teaching (open to seniors) as a requirement for its teacher's recommendation, but this is evidently not very far reaching, for "only a few students take a degree in education. Those who have had no experience do a little practice work in Oxford High School, under the supervision of the instructor and the high school principal." The university campus school was given up on account of a dearth of children.

The University of Missouri has perhaps the most efficiently organized practice school of secondary grade in the country. Starting very modestly in 1904, it has grown rapidly, and this year has enrolled two hundred and twenty-five pupils. The twenty dollar tuition fee from each thus provides an appreciable amount toward paying the running expenses. Practice teaching is required for the teacher's certificate, and only seniors are admitted to the course. The work covers the entire year of thirty-five weeks, with three periods per week. All the supervision is under the direct charge of the professor of theory and practice, but he is aided by an assistant professor in the same field, various professors of the academic subjects, and three special assistants in the high school. The principal and the lady assistant principal compose two of these last, so it is evident that the bulk of the teaching is in the hands of the practice students. The good will of the other high schools of the state is largely guaranteed by a wise provision with regard to the admission of pupils. "The Teachers College High School admits only those that have exhausted school opportunities at home. Students from accredited high schools will not be admitted." Students entering the university with conditions may enroll in the school, upon payment of the regular tuition fees less the five dollars entrance fee already paid to the university.

The University of Nebraska has a model school, started in 1908, which supplements the rather uncertain opportunities for practice teaching already enjoyed for several years in the local public schools, both elementary and secondary. The new school enrolls this year seventy pupils who pay ten dollars tuition per semester. As yet only the ninth and tenth grades are represented. In some respects this resembles the plan of Missouri, but here the

number of regular teachers is greater, five as opposed to three in the neighboring state, the supervision is entirely in the hands of the department, although the teachers in the public schools (where these are used) may offer criticisms, and only eighteen weeks of two periods per week are required in the practice course as against a full year at Missouri. Senior standing is necessary for entrance. Since the establishment of the Teachers College in September, 1908, the requirement for admission has been freshman standing. Although the student may then take up any work that is offered in the college, he is advised to defer the practice teaching until the senior year, and except in special cases does so. Conditions at Nebraska are in a state of flux, with the prospects of a return to the former requirements of junior standing for admission to the work in education.

The University of North Dakota is in process of transferring the former preparatory department to the Teachers College and of transforming it into a model school. Thus while practice teaching is neither required nor offered, yet "within the other courses, opportunity is given for some practice work in this partially established model school."

Ohio State University requires practice teaching for its teacher's recommendation, using the Columbus high schools for that purpose. The course is open to seniors and graduates, with the members of the education department doing all the supervision. Definite plans are on foot looking toward the establishment of a high school for one of the city districts, but it is intended to use this only as a model and observation school, and to continue the practice work in the other schools as heretofore.

The University of Oregon is requiring practice teaching for the teacher's recommendation this year for the first time. The local high school offers the facilities for this purpose, although next year a small high school in an adjoining town will also be available. The members of the department of education do substantially all the supervision; the practice work continues eighteen weeks of five periods each; and senior or graduate standing is requisite for admission to the course.

The University of Rochester utilizes the city high school by arrangement with the school authorities. Senior standing is required



for admission to the course, and the principal and class teachers share in the supervision.

The University of South Dakota is this year using its newly organized practice school for prospective secondary teachers, but continues its "affiliations" with the city schools (the first two grades only) for elementary work. The supervisory duties are divided between the department and the class teachers. The training for the elementary and the secondary teachers is widely differentiated, even the prerequisites for the practice course being absolutely separate. In the former case, the course is open to freshmen, while in the latter at least junior standing is necessary.

The University of Texas is offering an elective course in practice teaching this year for the first time, but it is proposed to make this compulsory hereafter. The local school will furnish the field for the present. The course covers two trimesters, but the actual practice will net approximately one half the college year with three to five periods per week.

The University of Washington uses all grades of the Seattle public schools for its practice work. Junior standing is required for admission, and the course continues for nineteen weeks with two periods of teaching per week. The supervision is shared about equally by the university department and the teachers in the public schools. Negotiations are pending looking toward the establishment of "permanent relations" between the university and the city schools, but the details of this arrangement have not yet been made public.

Wellesley College does not yet provide a course in practice teaching because the force of the education department is not sufficiently large to arrange for the work. The college already has the privilege, however, of practice teaching for graduate students in one of the local schools whenever it is desirable to utilize this opportunity.

West Virginia University offered no practice teaching in 1907-1908. This year the Morgantown public schools, from the fourth grade up through the high school, are being utilized for observation and practice. The actual teaching, preceded by three months of observation, covers six months time of one period per week. "Both observation and practice work are under close supervision, the regular teacher, the university professor in charge of the work,

and the class in training being present at each exercise, and each one is carefully prepared for by all present." None but seniors and graduates are admitted to the course, and all the supervision is in the hands of the department of education.

William and Mary College requires practice teaching for its teacher's recommendation. The work is taken in the fourth year of the teacher's course, which is here equivalent to sophomore collegiate standing. The kindergarten and four grades of the public schools supplement the practice school at the present time, but the latter will soon be reorganized and will absorb all grades of the town school from the kindergarten through the high school. The teaching covers a period of ten weeks, five days per week, the immediate charge of the supervision being in the hands of the principals, under the general direction of the professor of education.

The department of education at the University of Wisconsin offers no practice teaching, although such a course is given in the German department. Experiments are being made here and in the English department in requiring members of the teacher's course to teach classes of freshmen and sub-freshmen. The affiliations that exist between the university and the city schools apply to the high schools and certain of the elementary, but for purposes of observation merely.

The Normal Training School of the University of Wyoming, which prepares only for elementary teaching, has a small practice school of thirty pupils. Practice teaching is compulsory. "Complete preparation corresponding to a high school course of four full years work, together with one year of normal work," constitutes the prerequisite in academic courses. The supervision is performed exclusively by the members of the department.

#### IV. APPLICATION TO PRESENT CONDITIONS

There seems to be a reasonable agreement among the twenty-nine colleges and universities reporting as offering practice teaching as to what should be required for entering such a course.

The most frequent prerequisites are:

Psychology . . . . .	18 institutions.
Educational psychology . . . . .	19       "
History of education . . . . .	17       "
Principles of education . . . . .	15       "
Observation . . . . .	11       "

No other subject is required in more than seven institutions. If the psychology and the educational psychology be grouped, every department except Harvard, Stanford, McGill, and Nebraska demands a previous course in psychology of its practice students. Either the history or the principles of education are demanded by all but Adelphi, Colorado College, Columbia, Harvard, Stanford, Nebraska, and the University of Washington, while eight institutions require both these subjects. The field supplied by history and principles of education would appear decidedly broader than that covered by both the general and the educational psychology. In other words, looking at this question from the point of view of the bearing of these subjects upon the immediate and the future teaching of the student, the scope of the educational psychology might be somewhat broadened, if necessary, and the general psychology given up altogether.

The most evident shortcomings in the present prerequisites are a course in secondary education, and one or more special methods courses in the subject or subjects the student expects to teach. California, Colorado, Harvard, Mississippi, Ohio State, and South Dakota are the only institutions reporting a definite requirement in secondary education as a prerequisite for the practice work. The child of eleven is the child of seven, only four years older. The individual of fifteen is not the eleven year old with merely four years added. He is a changed being, for a new life has opened before him, new forces are at work within him that were dormant before, and he looks at the world from a different point of view. Not only are there new physical and mental conditions, but these new conditions demand new methods of treatment. These significant changes can be brought out nowhere so readily as in the course which treats the general subject of secondary education. Besides, too, the peculiar conditions surrounding the secondary schools of the particular state may here be treated in detail.



The fact that Illinois and Missouri are the only institutions reporting a special method course as a prerequisite for the practice teaching may perhaps be explicable on the ground that the questionnaire failed specifically to mention such a course in a rather long suggested list. Yet this touches one of the most fundamental weaknesses of the practice students today. Such is the lack of interrelation between the departments that in only nine of the reporting institutions does the education department unequivocally demand the recommendation of the other departments before admitting students to the practice course, although one other reports that "the advice of professors of the academic subject is usually accepted." Another university depends upon "intimate knowledge of the students" in the earlier work in the department, together with their academic record; and still another "refuses to admit students to the course who are not fitted to become teachers," but there is no indication of the standard of judgment involved. There is a crying need in most of our training institutions for substantial courses in the various subjects. Whether they are called special method courses or not is immaterial. In fact the name "teacher's course" might be rather preferable. At least this would avoid the use of a much abused and somewhat distasteful title. Many of the so-called teachers' courses devote themselves to a more extensive study of the subject in question rather than a more intensive study that shall pay particular attention to the possibilities of that subject in the secondary schools, discussing the various texts, the selection and arrangement of material, and furthermore, including a thorough going review of the subject matter that the students will be called upon to use.

This weakness in subject matter, particularly in the languages, was one of the greatest stumbling blocks with which I had to contend at the University of California. Although in the main, the students had good academic records and were doing at least acceptable work in their graduate courses, yet they were not sure of themselves in the very elementary facts of the subjects they were attempting to teach—Latin grammar, Greek syntax, German gender, etc. The properly conducted teacher's course should lay bare the student's shortcomings and strengthen him in these weaknesses. The other failing which seems to be common to the non-

linguistic subjects is lack of appreciation of relative values. In other words, the work of the student teacher lacks perspective; it is all confined to a single plane. Just as the infant fails to touch the objects for which he reaches, because he sees them all in the same vertical plane, so the young teacher fails to attain the object sought because he neglects the fact that teaching is a three dimension art, so to speak. It is absolutely essential that he pay attention to the light and shade, that some things should stand out in high relief, while others should drop back into comparative insignificance. The student looks at the presentation of a subject in much the same way that the layman views a drawing. He sees only the result, but he is not conscious of the way in which this result has been attained, nor could he reproduce the same effect. As well expect the student to understand the teaching possibilities of a subject from merely approaching it from the learner's point of view. The responsibility for giving the appreciation of the relative values in a particular subject thus belongs to the specialist in that subject, for he certainly understands the possibilities of his own field far better than the educational expert. The application of all this to class room practice, on the other hand, involves something beyond the mere psychological analysis. Herein lies the function of the education department. The development of the subject matter side in its practical aspects is one of the salient characteristics of the teacher's preparation in both the French and the German systems, and is of considerable significance in accounting for the superiority of their teachers' preparation. After such a teacher's course as the one thus briefly outlined, the department would be in position to say that in its own judgment the student was qualified from the subject matter point of view to begin the study of the teaching technique. Responsibility for subject matter I conceive to be no part of the function of the professor of the practice of teaching.

The irreducible minimum for entrance to the secondary practice teaching course, then, would appear to be: (1) psychology, preferably educational psychology; (2) principles of education; (3) secondary education; (4) a teacher's course in as many different subjects as the student expects to teach.

The principles of school hygiene, school administration, and

school management, in so far as they are essential for the ordinary teacher may readily be handled in connection with the practice course itself.

The time is rapidly approaching for us to discard the pernicious system of blanket licenses whereby the individual who is perhaps qualified to teach Latin is under the terms of his professional sanction led to believe he is competent to teach English, French, history, or any other subject he has ever studied, and even others in which he has scarcely opened a book. There was a time when there was such an individual as *the* engineer. Now we have civil engineers, mechanical engineers, mining engineers, and the list is still growing. The application to teaching is sufficiently obvious. The exigencies of present conditions do not justify a rigorous extension of this principle to the teaching profession today, but are education departments doing all they can to hasten the time when such application can be made?

From the reports given above, it is patent that there is no typical plan, nor even any consensus of opinion as to how the practice work should be given, whether in a school under the control of the department, in the public schools, or in a combination of them both. William and Mary, and Nebraska are the only places where the last named plan is in vogue,<sup>1</sup> and the former is even now about to take over the town schools. Of all the twelve institutions that have a practice school under the department of education, at only Illinois and Missouri are the schools fully organized and offering complete opportunities for practice.<sup>2</sup> Adelphi and Columbia are compelled to restrict the practice work on account of high tuition fees; Lehigh's school is of a special type that does not admit of any general application; the schools at Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, William and Mary, and Wyoming, are yet only partially organized. The other eighteen institutions where practice teaching is offered make use of the local schools, sometimes merely on sufferance as at California, Rochester, and others: sometimes by adopting the city principals and teachers and making them members of the education department, as at Colorado and Indiana;

<sup>1</sup>South Dakota uses its own school for secondary teachers, and the first and second grades of the local schools for elementary teachers.

<sup>2</sup>Exception must be made here to the several training schools connected with the university normals at Arkansas and Wyoming.



and sometimes by formal contract between the university and the board of education as at Brown. The very considerable tuition fees there and at Harvard make it possible to give a *quid pro quo* to the teachers for their services, at no actual financial cost to the institutions in question, an arrangement that would be quite unavailing at the state universities. In certain respects, the scheme as applied at Brown seems to present most advantageous conditions, opportunities that are but little short of those enjoyed by the University of Cincinnati in the preparation of elementary teachers. But the number of students that may be provided for at Brown is decidedly limited, it has been said not more than a third of the class, a limitation that would be fatal to its consideration by a state university. The plan followed by Harvard also has certain peculiar advantages, for the "opportunities for observation and practice teaching in that metropolitan community (Boston and its suburbs) are so good that no 'practice school' could offer comparable opportunities." Although all the schools that are utilized for practice purposes are within a half hour from the university, the problem of any close supervision by the department would seem to be rather serious. Certainly it would be so if any considerable number of students were taking the course.

In the long run, the only really satisfactory plan will be for each institution that is actively engaged in the training of teachers to have its own practice school. Without such a school there is no unified control of either curriculum or teaching force, and the head of the practice work will be continually hampered by the lack of freedom when he must add to his other troubles responsibility to a public school board, and the necessity of working in harmony with nearly as many different public school teachers as he has practice students. Under such conditions what opportunity is there for any unity of purpose or method? The plan of forming classes of conditioned freshmen has some advantages as a makeshift device, but it allows no organized school, and the problems of satisfactory supervision are almost insurmountable. The plan of holding elective and modern language classes for the upper grammar grades outside the regular school hours also has something in its favor, but it is open to both the former objections.

The University of Missouri has demonstrated conclusively that

it is possible to establish a secondary school for training purposes even in a small city, and to bring in therefrom a considerable revenue toward its running expenses through tuition fees. This sum might be still further supplemented by laboratory fees from the student teachers. Practice teaching is as much a laboratory subject as physics, chemistry, or engineering, and the material with which it deals is certainly far more valuable. The ordinary laboratory fee is expected to pay the running expenses of the laboratory. The education department would seem justified in charging as high a fee as that demanded by any other ordinary department of the university.

It would probably be impossible for even the most fortunately situated of our educational departments to offer practice teaching to more than fifty students per semester, or one hundred for the year provided the course was limited to a half year. Assuming the annual displacement of teachers to be fifteen per cent,<sup>1</sup> this would recruit a teaching force of six hundred and fifty or seven hundred, a number large enough to supply the accredited high schools in the great majority of our states. It has been argued that the state university in a small city could not provide adequate practice teaching for one hundred and fifty students per year. If this is true, as it probably is, why should not the practice course be closed when the enrollment has reached the number that can be provided for? Knowing the possibility of such a demand, the department of education would be in position to apply some selective test. Laboratory courses in our state universities have been closed to further registration before now when the resources of the department have been taxed to their utmost. Such a proceeding is by no means looked upon as un-American, nor as exposing the department to any unjust criticism. The education department thus has sufficient precedent for following a similar procedure, until it can expand its facilities to keep pace with the growing demand.

Furthermore, the home resources of the universities might be eked out within two or three years by an application of the German *Probejahr* system in a somewhat modified form. There are three

<sup>1</sup>HOLMES, *The present provision for the education and training of secondary teachers in the United States*, in the Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, p. 63.

evident objections to such a plan: first, it implies a fifth year of college work, and few if any of our states are in position to demand this extra expenditure of time and money; second, the teaching force in the high schools is hardly competent to undertake this responsibility; and third, the local objections against having the children "practiced upon" would be too strong.

In the first place, cut the year in half and let it be a *Probe-semester*. With the rapid extension of the elective system, or its modified form the group system, it is reasonably possible for the brightest students to complete the college course in three and one half years, and with a little incentive, more of them could do so without detriment to their work. Arrange their work in such fashion that all the requirements for their degree except the practice teaching course shall have been fulfilled by the middle of their senior year. Their other education courses ought to be out of the way by that time any way, a very simple arrangement if the psychology were begun by the middle of the sophomore year. The student could then spend the last half of the senior year in active work in some selected high school of the state. It would simply be the plan that has been tried so successfully at Brown and Harvard for several years, without the direct supervision of the education department. Only the brighter students could do this, and they would probably be willing to go away in order to gain the larger opportunity for real teaching under normal conditions than they could get in the university practice school. Upon the successful completion of their teaching work, they could return to the university and graduate with their class. Thus they would gain the bachelor's degree, and they would have had a half year of the most practical sort of work, all within the space of four years. Eventually, as conditions improve, this would all be transferred to the graduate year.

In the second place, it may be objected that the teaching force is not competent to undertake this responsibility. Surely among the hundreds of high school teachers in each state, some might be found that had this ability at least potentially. The school examiner, whose acquaintance is wide among the teachers of his state, could select a few of the most promising teachers in each subject. These could be invited to attend one or two summer



schools, where the professor of practice could show them his point of view and give them a good, thorough-going course in the sort of work he expected them to do. The honor of being selected for this work, together with the slight financial emolument that would have to go with each student thus sent out, would be sufficient to attract most of those whom the department wanted. The honor of being thus distinguished by the university would be a good business asset. Within a very few years under such a system, the university would have a body of teachers for such work that would easily supply its wants.

In the third place, the local objections against this practice teaching are far stronger in the imagination than they are in the reality. Everything depends upon the way the system is tried. The school board of Providence puts such students in the high school and pays them four hundred dollars a year for their work. Harvard has been able to place its students in the surrounding high schools, where they have been entrusted with class teaching for a half year, under close supervision, of course, of a regular teacher. A similar arrangement at the University of Colorado has been able to "save the Boulder schools many who would otherwise drop out." The plan as worked out at Colorado, which has previously been described at some length, has already been tried in some of its details for several years at the University of California with similar success, so much so that several of the elementary schools actually asked the university for student teachers in order that the general average of the public school class might be appreciably raised. With such a scheme in working order the communities that were selected for this practice teaching would enjoy unusual advantages when they came to appoint new teachers, for they would virtually be able to try out the new material at no appreciable cost to themselves.

The university would naturally expect to test the progress of the student during the last half year by suitable examinations held at the university at its close, but the report of success in active teaching must necessarily be the weightier factor in determining the final grading for the course.

The application of these suggestions to the practice teaching would not furnish the panacea for all the ills to which we are heir, but it would provide for an enlargement of the facilities for the

training of teachers that is capable of constant expansion, that will keep pace with the increasing needs of the schools, and that will save the secondary schools from the incubus of the largely unsupervised practice teaching that is being done by the newly elected teachers, *after* they have received a regular appointment. As a matter of social economy, therefore, these suggestions ought strongly to be urged.







## THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS BULLETIN

(Continued from inside front cover.)

### HUMANISTIC SERIES

2. *The Evolution of "Causa" in the Contractual Obligations of the Civil Law*, by Samuel Peterson. 24 p. January, 1905. 25 cents.
3. *De Witt's Colony*, by Ethel Z. Rather. 99 p., 4 maps. 1905. 35 cents.
5. *The Grotesque in the Poetry of Robert Browning*, by Lily B. Campbell. 41 p. April, 1907. 25 cents.
6. *The Beginnings of Texas*, by R. C. Clark. 94 p., map. December, 1907. 75 cents.
7. *Railroad Transportation in Texas*, by C. S. Potts. 214 p., 6 maps, charts. March, 1909. \$1.50.

### MEDICAL SERIES

1. *Yellow Fever: a Popular Lecture*, by James Carroll. 32 p. June, 1905. 15 cents.
2. *The Care of the Insane*, by Dr. M. L. Graves. 16 p. 1905. 15 cents.
3. *The 1903 Epidemic of Yellow Fever in Texas, and the Lesson to be Learned from it*, by Dr. G. R. Tabor. 22 p. June, 1905. 15 cents.

### SCIENTIFIC SERIES

5. *Test of a Vertical Triple Expansion High-Duty Pumping Engine in Operation at the Water Works, San Antonio, Texas*, by A. C. Scott. 52 p. illus. pl. June, 1905. 35 cents.
6. *Vegetation in the Sotol Country in Texas*, by W. L. Bray. 24 p., pl. June, 1905. 25 cents.
7. *Observations on the Habits of Some Solitary Wasps of Texas*, by Carl Hartman. 72 p., pl. July, 1905. 25 cents.
8. *The Protection of Our Native Birds*, by T. H. Montgomery, Jr. 30 p. October, 1906. 25 cents.
9. *The Austin Electric Railway System*, by members of the Senior Class in Electrical Engineering, 1906. 123 p., illus. pl. 1906. 50 cents.
10. *Distribution and Adaptation of the Vegetation of Texas*, by W. L. Bray, 108 p., pl. map. November, 1906. 35 cents.
11. *A Sketch of the Geology of the Chisos Country*, by J. A. Udden. 101 p. April, 1907. 50 cents.
12. *The Clays of Texas*, by Heinrich Ries, 316 p., illus. pl. 1908. \$2.00.
13. *The American Mistletoe*, by H. H. York. 31 p., pl. 1909. 50 cents.

To those who desire it a complete list of the publications of the University of Texas will be furnished. Requests for this or for Bulletins should be addressed to the University of Texas Bulletin, Austin, Texas. Exchanges should be addressed to the University of Texas Library.



# THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Co-educational.

Tuition Free.

## ANNUAL EXPENSES, \$180 AND UPWARDS

MAIN UNIVERSITY AT AUSTIN

**COLLEGE OF ARTS:** Courses leading to the Degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy.

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:** Professional courses for teachers, leading to elementary and permanent certificates.

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT:** Degree courses in civil, electrical and mining engineering.

**LAW DEPARTMENT** (in its new building): Three-year course, leading to Degree of Bachelor of Laws, with State license; course leading to Degree of Master of Laws.

**SUMMER SCHOOL:** Regular University and Normal courses; seven weeks.

Session of 1910 begins June 18.

For catalogue address

THE REGISTRAR,  
University Station, Austin.

**DEPARTMENT OF EXTENSION:** I. Correspondence Division, offering courses in various University schools, for which registration may take place at any time. II. Public Discussion and Information Division, through bibliographies and traveling libraries supplying information on current problems. III. Lecture Division, presenting members of the University Faculty in popular lectures, singly or in series.

For catalogue address

THE DIRECTOR OF EXTENSION,  
University Station, Austin.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT AT GALVESTON

Four-year course in medicine; two-year course in pharmacy; three-year course in nursing. Thorough laboratory training. Exceptional clinical facilities in John Sealy Hospital. University Hall, a dormitory for women students of medicine.

For catalogue address

THE DEAN, Medical College,  
Galveston.